

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 30 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 7, 9-14, 19, and 21-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-3, 6, 15, 18, 27, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0169335). The Examiner stated essentially that Monroe teaches all the limitations of claims 1-3, 6, 15, 18, 27, and 29.

Under 35 U.S.C. 102, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. See MPEP §2131. It is respectfully submitted that at the very minimum, Monroe is legally deficient to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claims 1, 15, 27, and 29.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a signal display for displaying the signal pattern generated by said generated signal template as a visual image; a signal display controller for controlling position and orientation of said signal display." Claim 15 claims, *inter alia*, "acquiring, visually, an image of the signal pattern displayed by the signal display using the visual recording device." Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, "a signal display controller for controlling a position and an orientation of said signal display relative to a signal receiving device, wherein the signal pattern is visible to the signal receiving device." Claim 29 claims, *inter alia*, "a visual recording device for visually determining a signal pattern of a signal display, wherein the signal pattern is a visual pattern of blobs."

Monroe teaches a ground based security system for aircraft (see Abstract). Monroe teaches that a camera, either installed in the aircraft or on the ground, may be controlled by a ground based system for monitoring purposes (see paragraphs [0074] and [0092]).

Referring to claims 1 and 27, Monroe teaches that a camera has pan and tilt capabilities (see Figures 3B and 5 and paragraphs [0074] and [0076-0080]). Monroe teaches that monitors display images captured by a camera (see paragraph [0097]). Monroe does not teach “a signal display controller for controlling position and orientation of said signal display” as claimed in claim 1 or “a signal display controller for controlling a position and an orientation of said signal display relative to a signal receiving device, wherein the signal pattern is visible to the signal receiving device” as claimed in claim 27. Nowhere does Monroe teach that a position and orientation of a display is controlled by a signal display controller. The monitors of Monroe are simple display devices and have no controller for position and orientation. Thus, Monroe does not teach “a signal display controller for controlling position and orientation of said signal display” as claimed in claim 1 or “a signal display controller for controlling a position and an orientation of said signal display” as claimed in claim 27. Therefore, Monroe fails to teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 27.

Referring to claims 15 and 29, Monroe teaches wireless communication of digital signals from a camera to a base station (see paragraph [0074]). Monroe does not teach “acquiring, visually, an image of the signal pattern displayed by the signal display using the visual recording device” as claimed in claim 15 or “a visual recording device for visually determining a signal pattern of a signal display, wherein the signal pattern is a visual pattern of blobs” as claimed in claim 29. Monroe’s transmission of a digital signal from a camera to a base station (see paragraph [0074]) is not analogous to a communication from a signal display to a visual

recording device, essentially as claimed in claims 15 and 29. Monroe teaches a camera capturing a view of an aircraft (see Abstract). Nowhere does Monroe teach a camera having a view of an image displayed on a signal display. Thus, Monroe does not teach visually determining a signal pattern of a signal display, essentially as claimed in claims 15 and 29. Therefore, Monroe fails to teach all the limitations of claims 15 and 29.

Claims 2, 3, and 6 depend from claim 1. Claim 18 depends from claims 15. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 15, respectively. At least claims 6 and 18 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 6 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, “automatically adjusting pan and tilt of the visual recording device to have a view of the signal pattern displayed by the signal display.”

Monroe teaches a camera having a view of an aircraft (see Abstract). Monroe does not teach or suggest “automatically adjusting pan and tilt of the visual recording device to have a view of the signal pattern displayed by the signal display” as claimed in claims 6 and 18. The camera of Monroe is used for monitoring and tracking aircraft (see paragraph [0035]). The camera of Monroe is directed at transportation vehicles. Monroe does not teach directing a pan and tilt of a camera to have a view of a display, much less a signal pattern being displayed. Therefore, Monroe fails to teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 18.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 17, 20, 28, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, and further in view of Rhoads (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0005093). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Monroe and Rhoads teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 17, 20, 28, and 30.

Multiple cited prior art references must suggest the desirability of being combined, and the references must be viewed without the benefit of hindsight afforded by the disclosure. The Examiner has chosen a multitude of references, apparently in hindsight, to reject claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 17, 20, 28, and 30, however, each reference relates to an entirely different art, for example, Monroe teaches that a camera may be controlled by a ground based system for monitoring aircraft (see Figure 3B), and Rhoads teaches a monitoring system for downloading images from the Internet and identifying embedded digital watermark data (see paragraph [0006]). Given the different fields of the references (e.g., aircraft security and monitoring digital watermarks), and the lack of a suggestion or motivation to combine the references, these references are not believed to be combinable. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

At least claims 8, 28, and 30 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claim 8 recites, “wherein the blobs are groups of adjoining pixels each having an identical pixel value.” Claims 28 and 30 claim, “wherein each blob is a plurality of adjoining pixels each having an identical pixel value, wherein a pixel value is selected from the group consisting of black and white.”

Monroe teaches a camera having a view of an aircraft (see Abstract). Nowhere does Monroe teach or suggest pixels, much less a blob as a plurality of adjoining pixels each having an identical pixel value, essentially as claimed in claims 8, 28, and 30. Therefore, Monroe fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 8, 28, and 30.

Rhoads teaches that blobs occur in ink based printing (see paragraph [0332]). Rhoads does not teach or suggest that the pixels have an identical pixel value, essentially as claimed in claims 8, 28, and 30. Rhoads teaches that blobs are dithered ink pixels, e.g., a mixture of colors (see paragraph [0332]). Rhoads does not teach that blobs have identical pixel values. Further,

Rhoads teaches away from the use of blobs, wherein Rhoads states, “the isolated information carrying capacity of the original pixel becomes compromised.” According to Rhoads, blobs compromise information carrying capacity. Thus, Rhoads fails to teach or suggest a blob as a plurality of adjoining pixels each having an identical pixel value, essentially as claimed in claims 8, 28, and 30. Therefore, Rhoads fails to cure the deficiencies of Monroe.

The combined teachings of Monroe and Rhoads fail to teach or suggest “wherein each blob is a plurality of adjoining pixels each having an identical pixel value” as claimed in claims 28 and 30, and essentially as claimed in claim 8. Therefore, claims 8, 28, and 30 are believed to be allowable over the combined teachings of Monroe and Rhoads. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1 to 30, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. Chau & Associates, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike
Suite 501
East Meadow, NY 11554
Tel: (516) 357-0091
Fax: (516) 357-0092